

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application as amended. Claims 1-36 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 25, 29, and 33 have been amended. No claims have been canceled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 15, 18-26, 29, 30, 33 and 34

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 15, 18-26, 29-30 and 33-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that it is not clear how to differentiate in the claimed invention between the plurality of Web Services and identified plurality of Web Services. Applicants have amended the claims to remove “identified” to clarify the plurality of Web Services.

In addition, the Examiner stated that it is not clear whether the transmitted Web Service composition is ever executed and whether the transaction information for the user is generated. Applicants respectfully point to the claim language describing “wherein the user system executes the Web Service composition to invoke at least one of the plurality of Web Services to perform a transaction to generate transaction information for the request.” Therefore, the claims describe that the transmitted Web Service composition is executed and the transaction information is generated.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be removed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 15, 18-26, 29-30 and 33-34

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 15, 18-26, 29-30 and 33-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0046119 (hereinafter “Yamamoto”) in view of Nakagawa, U.S. Patent No. 7,266,376 (hereinafter “Nakagawa”).

Yamamoto describes a user registering an action schedule including (1) moving by train, (2) seeing a movie, (3) dinner, and (4) moving by train. The user leaves the home with a mobile device and makes a purchase using the mobile device (buys a movie ticket, pays for dinner). A support service detects a user has completed an act and displays the next act on the mobile device.

Nakagawa discloses that a user specifies schedule data to a server and the server stores the schedule data. For example, the user specifies that on October 11, there is a sales meeting from 7:10-11:30, there is meeting with a corporation at 13:30 to 16:30, and the user is to go on board the Hikari Super Express No. 312 departing from Tokyo station at 19:20. The server requests weather information and event information from other servers and stores the information. The server receives positional information from the user's mobile phone and searches for a traveling route, based on the positional, weather, and event information. The server transmits a traveling route to the mobile phone.

Independent claims 1, 13, 25, 29, and 33 claim a server receiving a user request from a user and identifying a plurality of Web Services to be performed to service the user request. Yamamoto does not teach or suggest a server that receives a user request because Yamamoto, in fact, teaches away from a server receiving a user request. Yamamoto describes that information is "pushed" to a mobile device so that a user does not have to request transmission of the information. (Yamamoto, ¶87). Yamamoto discloses that information is preferably received by the mobile device *without being accompanied by any explicit transmission request by the user*. Yamamoto, therefore, fails to teach or suggest a server receiving a user request from a user and identifying a plurality of Web Services to be performed to service the user request, as claimed.

Nakagawa also fails to teach or suggest these elements of claims 1, 13, 25, 29, and 33. Nakagawa does not describe a server that receives a user request because Nakagawa does not disclose a user request. Nakagawa describes that a user provides schedule data to a server. For example, the user specifies that on October 11, there is a sales meeting from 7:10-11:30, there is meeting with a corporation at 13:30 to 16:30, and the user is to go on board the Hikari Super Express No. 312 departing from Tokyo station at 19:20. However, the schedule data

in Nakagawa is not equivalent to a user request because the user is not making a request, but is rather providing a schedule to a server. No part of Nakagawa describes that a server receives a user request. Nakagawa, therefore, does not teach a server receiving a user request from a user and identifying a plurality of Web Services to be performed to service the user request, as claimed. Therefore, the combination of Yamamoto and Nakagawa fails to teach or suggest receiving a user request from a user and identifying a plurality of Web Services to be performed to service the user request, as claimed.

Furthermore, the Examiner has asserted Official Notice that Applicants' business process modeling language is sufficiently well-known that one of skill would use it in combination with Yamamoto and Nakagawa. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice and respectfully request the Examiner produce evidence that Applicants' business process modeling language is well-known as required under MPEP 2144.03(C).

For the reasons stated above the combination of Yamamoto, Nakagawa, and Official Notice fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 13, 25, 29, and 33 are patentable over the cited references. Given that dependent claims 2-3 and 6-12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, claims 15, and 18-24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 13, claim 26 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 25, claim 30 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 29, and claim 34 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 33, Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-13, 15, 18-26, 29-30, and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 15, 18-26, 29-30, and 33-34 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicants hereby request such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: January 13, 2010

/Joan Obispo Arbolante/

Joan Obispo Arbolante

Reg. No 58,642

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300